HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 44 Saturday, November 3, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Next week — and thereafter — HUMAN EVENTS will come to you ONE DAY LATER than you have received it in the past. This will enable our staff to give a full report on the significance of the election returns. When Congress meets, the extra day will enable us to cover the entire legislative week.

How to Read Election Returns: As cataracts of statistics descend on listeners election night, there will probably be some hastily constructed catchwords and garbled, careless misconceptions which can lead astray those who seek to interpret the results.

One of these is "The President ran ahead of his party." Liberal columnists and commentators, who traditionally exalt the Chief Executive above his party and the Legislative arm, like to use the phrase. White House Palace Guard people favor it, for it tends to increase their self-importance.

The plain fact is that there is nothing extraordinary when a President in a general election runs ahead of his party. The records show that Presidential candidates almost always do so, that in the last 15 Presidential elections this was the case in 14. The one exception was the freakish 1948 election when the Democrats split into three parties on the ballot. In 1952, Ike ran ahead of his ticket, but beat the record up to that date by only an eyelash.

Hence, the persistent conclusion offered by liberal columnists — that the Republican party is incurably weak — is a dangerous myth against which the reader or listener must guard as the returns come in.

● Reporters on the air or in the press become enchanted with the exciting word, "landslide," on election night. The fact is that most general election results are "electoral landslides," but not necessarily "popular landslides." Thus Harry Truman in 1948 won 303 electoral votes to 189 for Dewey — indeed a "landslide." But he got only 24,105,695 popular votes, which was slightly less than a majority (total vote of opponents was 24,727,985).

Ike in 1952 enjoyed a colossal electoral landslide, 442 to 89. But numerous scribes mislabelled his popular-vote victory a "landslide." Actually, he won 54.9 per cent of the popular vote. That, indeed, is a comfortable superiority (all too comfortable to suit the Democrats' taste).

But the term "landslide," as applied to the popular vote, traditionally has been used when candidates took in the neighborhood of 60 per cent or better of the votes. Thus, Harding won in 1920 with 62 per cent of the popular vote; Hoover a shade less than 60 per cent in 1928; Roosevelt in 1936 got 62 per cent. Those were "landslides."

● Look twice at claims that "the Solid South will be cracked, as in 1952." The Solid South, Washington opinion has it, was never penetrated in the first place. Florida, especially in the counties (Dade and Pinellas) where Ike rolled up his majorities, has a large number of transplanted Northerners; Texas, with its relatively small Negro population (about ten per cent) should be classed with the West, rather than the South; the northern counties of Virginia are heavily populated with Federal Government employees drawn from all over the country.

Tennessee has a substantial two-party system with the two eastern of its nine districts represented in Congress by Republicans. [In the Second District, Knox County, which gave Eisenhower a 17,677 majority in 1952, has an especially strong Republican contingent, while the two counties containing Northern immigrants to the Federal project at Oak Ridge, Roane and Anderson, between them gave Ike large enough majorities (1,881 and 1,550, respectively) to furnish his margin over Adlai (2,437).] Although South Carolina teetered on the brink of going Republican, the tier of Deep South states (from the Carolinas to Arkansas and Louisiana), remained Solid in '52.

● As election eve approaches, there is uncertainty as to which party has made the most effective appeal to the Negro voter. Republicans feel that the Supreme Court's school decision went far to break the Democratic hold on the Negro — a feeling reinforced by the phenomenal number of Negro leaders that have endorsed Eisenhower.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Baltimore *Afro-American*, Harlem's *Amsterdam News*, and *The Pittsburgh Courier* (with the country's biggest Negro circulation) are among the leading Negro newspapers that are backing the Republican ticket. Their influence, plus that of such men as Adam Clayton Powell, is expected to pull a segment of the Negro vote towards Eisenhower. (Indicative of the way Negro leaders feel: Negro Congressman William Dawson, backing Stevenson, was booed at a Chicago meeting of 500 Negro ministers.)

Surveys in New York estimate that the Negro Democratic vote there will be somewhat lower than in 1952. This seems to be about the best the Republicans can do. Despite the movement of Negro leaders to Ike, the political dopesters believe that the great percentage of the Negro rank and file will stick with the Democrats. They reason that relief, public housing and patronage jobs furnished by the Democratic city machines make more of an impression than the argument over segregated schools.

States' Rights Party: The campaign of the new States' Rights party has inspired the astonishment and wonder of political observers here. A HUMAN EVENTS staff reporter covered a party meeting across the District of Columbia line in Montgomery County, Maryland, several days ago. The hall contained a demonstrative crowd of about 500. A meeting in the same place by the GOP a week before, with the GOP Governor McKeldin and the local GOP Congressman present, brought out only 150. The States' Rights party crowd listened to two leaders of the movement, Dean Clarence Manion and Miss Vivien Kellems.

Talking to people who have joined the movement, our correspondent got the impression that they think less of their chances at the polls than of an opportunity to make an auspicious beginning for a four-year campaign culminating in 1960. They repeat Manion's line that a vote for the States' Right candidate is not a vote thrown away. Manion points out that leftist movements — the Populists, Progressives, Socialists, Communists — over the last half-century left their mark on the two major parties, and drew them to the Left. Now, he says, is the time to provide a counterweight, on the Right, to draw them back in that direction.

Observers here will be surprised if the States' Rights party gets much of a vote, in view of the following circumstances: (1) The States' Rights campaign started only on October 15, leaving little more than two weeks for campaign work, in contrast to the over two months which the two major parties enjoyed. (2) It is an open secret among party followers that not more than $30,000 was provided for the war chest — as compared, for instance, with the $7 million for the Republicans. (3) The Presidential candidate, T. Coleman Andrews, goes forth to "beat the bushes" only when his private business permits. He calls himself the "week-end candidate," and that's about the size of it. Finally, there was so little time that the party managed to get on the ballot in only 14 states. Yes, it is natural that political veterans wonder at the vitality of the little party.

Israel's Hour: Four weeks ago, HUMAN EVENTS (September 29) warned that Britain and France might prod Israel into attacking Egypt. Today, along the Capital's diplomatic row, there is much talk that this is what actually occurred. Foreign attaches feel that little Israel would scarcely have dared to make such an audacious decision unless it had received some assurances from the larger powers concerned. In political Washington, a similar view of the situation is held — although without any disposition to excuse Israel for what is regarded as a cold and cynical piece of aggression. Even some Democrats find it difficult to blame the President for his energetic pressure on the Israelis, the day before the action, to try to keep them from starting a war.

Experts on international affairs mention one paradoxical feature of Israel's action. For Israel took a step — in effect a "unilateral preventive war" — which is very damaging to the spirit of the United Nations. Yet the UN was an important factor in enabling the Zionists to get control of the Holy Land originally. The rather crudely pragmatic nature of how the Zionists got this control is now recalled, as well as the harm inflicted on the Arabs who had resided in this land for upwards of 1,500 years, and whose lands were expropriated by the Jews.

HUMAN EVENTS was one of the very few periodicals in the country that treated the Israel story realistically, beginning with an article "Zionism As Imperialism," by Frank C. Hanighen, on September 18th, 1946. In this piece, it was shown how "Zionist nationalism started pick-a-back on British Imperialism" when Zionism got commitments from the British Empire in World War I, and commenced its infiltration of Palestine.

The Israel adventure of this week raises the question — among observers here — as to whether Zionist nationalism has now moved into its full phase of imperialism, in a vast scheme to bring under control or under its flag a large part of the Arabic Middle East, along the frontiers of biblical Israel.

An almost incredible story is going the rounds of the Embassy quarter of Wash-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ington: that actually the State Department (if not the White House) had been aware for at least six weeks that Israel, Britain and France would move into Egypt. But the State Department — as the story goes — obtained assurances that these powers would not move until after election day. Hence, some of the anger directed at these governments is mainly because the three broke their promise and — for some undecipherable reason — chose to move into the field of battle this week.

Poland and Hungary: The GOP stands a good chance of retaining its 1952 gains among the Poles, Hungarians and other minorities in the U.S. — as experts on election statistics see it. Earlier, it was feared that this would not be the case, but the development of favorable events in those countries and burgeoning hopes for a happier situation have been credited to the incumbent Administration by some leaders among these minority groups. Actually, experts realize, neither Democratic nor Republican regimes had anything constructive to do with the revolutionary upheavals in the satellites, despite assertions to the contrary by the Kremlin propaganda.

Those who know the situation in Washington well confess that under the Eisenhower Administration, as under the Truman Administration, the attitude of the bureaucracy of the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has been generally one of discouraging any hopes of an overturn behind the Iron Curtain and of turning aside any proposals for exploiting discontent among these peoples with their masters. Mr. George Kennan, formerly one of the leading lights of this bureaucracy, has made no secret of his attitude towards this whole area — regarding the Russian-imposed boundaries and hegemony as final, at least for decades to come.

It should be pointed out that this bureaucracy — it is well known here — is composed to a considerable extent of leftists and socialists, some of whom originated from these Eastern areas and who retain a pro-Communist or pro-Soviet attitude which was prevalent in intellectual circles during World War II. It is known that these types have regarded revolution to overthrow Eastern European communism with anxiety, saying that it could only enthrone "reactionary" and "fascistic" elements of the population in those states.

This attitude — which has caused U.S. policy to be so inactive for so long towards Poland, Hungary and other Eastern states — now is the cause of State Department inability today to adopt some constructive policy to forward the progress of the Polish and Hungarian revolutions. Since inaction and lack of hope in potential revolution were actually official policy, naturally there are no plans to unveil today. This backwardness of the bureaucracy is — it is believed — reflected in the columns of Walter Lippmann, who writes that "Titoism" in these states would be more desirable from the standpoint of the United States than complete overthrow. He neglects to say that "Titoism" is actually "national communism."

All the above explains why nothing has been or is likely now to be done to hasten the end of the Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain in Europe.

Liberal Resentment: Liberal Democrats ardently campaigning for Adlai Stevenson are beginning to voice openly their resentment against the New York State organization, headed by Tammany chieftain-National Committeeman Carmine deSapio, for its obvious lack of enthusiasm for the Stevenson-Kefauver ticket.

Grumblings have been heard from the ADA-Walter Reuther wing of the party for a couple of weeks or so. In recent days, it has been picked up by the wing's claque of pundits. Columnist Marquis Childs now does a piece saying that one of the major causes for the ticket's lack of progress in New York has been "the inordinate ambition" of Governor Averell Harriman.

He says Harriman "has made most of the loyal gestures with a solemn face," but that "all is in readiness [in New York] for the formation on November 7 of the first and largest chapter of the I-told-you-so society, with Harriman as president and grand chief issuer of sorrowful statements and deSapio as vice president and principal hand-wringer."

More cynical Washington political observers say Childs' target is a bit out of focus; the real reason for the Democratic sitting on hands in New York, they say, is not Harriman's "inordinate ambition" but rather deSapio's well-founded premonition that if Stevenson by any chance should be elected, he (deSapio) would be on the far outside fringes as far as any patronage was concerned.

Rather than risk that, deSapio much prefers to sit this one out and take his chances on 1960; he might have more success then than he did this year, when at the Chicago convention he was one of the bitter-end, anti-Stevenson holdouts, thus assuring himself of no patronage consideration whatsoever, no matter what.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Daily Worker: The *Daily Worker*, official organ of the Communist party, U.S.A., after several days of travail, finally decided what happened in Hungary.

The real reason for the continued fighting there, it says, was a spontaneous protest against the Stalin-type "force and repression" of previous governments; it was not any "counterrevolutionary plot" against socialism (the *Worker's* euphemistic spelling for communism) nor was it any demonstration of anti-Sovietism. The *Worker* conveniently overlooks the fact that the fighting continued until the Government was broadened to include non-Communists in top positions and the Russian troops pulled out.

The true significance of the *Daily Worker's* initial floundering and then its lame explanation of the Hungarian situation, say students of the Red movement, is that international communism obviously is grasping at straws to maintain the fiction of harmony and accord behind the post-Stalin Iron Curtain.

As in the case of its acceptance of the new Gomulka government in Poland (see HUMAN EVENTS for October 27), the *Worker* is trying valiantly to depict communism of the post-Stalin era as a benign movement seeking only the improved welfare of those who live under it.

Say the experts: communism may change its garb, but under the masquerade it is still the same old communism, to be neither trusted nor accepted.

Labor Monopoly: In connection with the article in last week's HUMAN EVENTS, "Labor Monopoly Rests on Violence," by one-time NRA Administrator Donald R. Richberg, Washington observers comment that the monopolistic union practices condemned by Mr. Richberg have been strengthened substantially by the 11-months-old merger of the AFL and CIO.

In the pre-merger days when the two parent organizations were rivals, it is pointed out, two rival unions functioned in most of the important fields, such as mass-production industries. National Labor Relations Board representation elections, to determine what, if any, union should represent workers in a plant or industry, usually gave those workers a choice between AFL and CIO unions.

With the amalgamation of the parent organizations, however, "raiding" and competition between rival unions in the same field has virtually disappeared, with a few exceptions; certain "bad boy" organizations, such as the Brotherhood of Teamsters, refuse to abide by "no raiding" agreements and occasionally there are jurisdictional disputes even between old-line unions.

But on the whole, NLRB representation elections have boiled down to a question of one particular union or no union, and workers in general have no choice but to maintain their membership in whatever union is certified as collective bargaining agent for the plant where they are employed.

The whole tenor of the "no raiding" pact, the "one big happy family" merger atmosphere, and the general sense of sweetness and amity within the union world, say these observers, is simply to accentuate — at the expense of workers — the monopolistic union powers discussed by Mr. Richberg.

Correction: The office of Senator Bricker (R.-O.) writes in to correct an erroneous impression given in our News Section, October 20, and informs us that the Senator has actually been campaigning strenuously, day in and day out, for the GOP ticket during this campaign period.

Letter from J. E. SCHAEFFER, Vice President, Boeing Airplane Co., General Manager, Wichita Division: "HUMAN EVENTS is somewhat new to me and Mrs. Schaeffer — refreshingly new. Our introduction to HUMAN EVENTS occurred at Christmas time when my good friend General Wedemeyer sent us a gift subscription. We are indeed grateful to him for his thoughtfulness and to HUMAN EVENTS for its informative, fair and dynamic coverage of current issues and events."

You know of people who will be as grateful to you for a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS as Mr. Schaeffer is to General Wedemeyer.

Act on that impulse; order gift subscriptions for them today!

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

Bound Volumes for 1956 — indexed — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; pre-publication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 44 HUMAN EVENTS November 3, 1956

Article Section

THE SOVEREIGN STATES

How Americans Can End Federal Usurpation

By JAMES JACKSON KILPATRICK

This article is taken, in part, from the concluding section of *The Sovereign States,* a scholarly and readable study of the constitutional issue of States' Rights. The author, James Jackson Kilpatrick, is the distinguished editor of the Richmond (Va.) *News-Leader.* Mr. Kilpatrick's book will be published in 1957 by the Henry Regnery Co. You may order it now (for February delivery) from HUMAN EVENTS at the pre-publication price of $4.95.

IT HAS BEEN two and a half years now, since the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision in the school segregation cases. What began as a sudden and violent storm, in the summer of 1954, has settled down in the autumn of 1956 to slow and steady rain. Now and then, as in Sturgis and Clinton, lightning flashes; but over most of the Old South and the Deep South, the people have closed their shutters. From time to time we even talk of other things. Many of us had begun to think we never would.

These months have witnessed a bitter experience for the South. Prior to the Court's decision, Dixie had basked in the pleasant warmth of a "good press." When national magazines dispatched correspondents below the Potomac, it was to report on the "New South," a burgeoning land of industrial opportunity, rising wages, and steadily expanding markets. The emissaries of Mr. Luce, arriving in a safari of Leica-bearers, devoted themselves to such amenities as our fox hunts, our plantations, our museums and universities.

But midnight struck for Cinderella, and May 17 came for the South; our coach became a pumpkin, our horses turned to mice. Suddenly the South found itself denounced as a land of "racists" and "bigots." As the weeks passed, an infestation developed of carpetbagger journalists; they made the grand tour — Richmond, Farmville, Charleston, Atlanta, Birmingham, Jackson, Nashville — and returned to their typewriters to compose the screeds they could have written without leaving Manhattan. With virtually one voice, they raised a chorus in support of racial integration; some of them, singing a more moderate baritone, conceded that the South had a difficult problem, but it was nothing, they were certain, that could not be settled simply by obedience to the mandates of the Court.

THIS AVALANCHE of criticism from the North, stunning in its violence, was in many respects the least serious of the consequences. The worst outgrowth of the Court's decision — and it is this which concerns Southerners most deeply — is to be found in the swift deterioration of an interracial *modus vivendi* that had been fashioned with painstaking care. Prior to May of 1954, the Southern States had been moving steadily toward a higher and better plateau of race relations. Within the essential framework of separation that is the basis of the South's daily life, a new and closer structure was being erected. All that has stopped now. The white and Negro races are farther apart in the South today — farther apart spiritually — than they have been in a generation. It is a bad thing.

Yet there is consolation to be found in the rule of *ex malo bonum.* These somber months

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have offered some good with much ill. The South has been forced to take a long and introspective look at some of its institutions, and at some of its leaders. We have learned a great deal about both races in the process — the palpable shortcomings of the Negro, the petty discriminations of the white — and for the first time we have pondered the reasons (not the instincts or prejudices, but the rational and prudent reasons) for maintaining racial separation in certain areas of intimate, personal and prolonged relationship. This has been good for us.

The greatest benefit, however, is to be found in the fresh and widespread concern for constitutional government that has resulted from the Court's opinion. If Mr. Warren's thunderbolt shocked the South, it has thankfully awakened a legion of conservatives elsewhere. Over a period of ninety years, the Southern States faithfully had worked toward compliance with the Constitution as they repeatedly were told the Constitution was to be understood. On the foundation of a hundred appellate opinions, on the firm basis of the Tenth Amendment, they had established their systems of public schools. Now, shockingly, what had been constitutional at noon was unconstitutional by one o'clock. Whole States that had been law-abiding in the morning were in violation of the law by evening. The very magnitude of the decision made a profound impression that other mandates, equally arrogant, had failed to make.

For this was not, of course, the first time such a thing had happened. It was not even the first time it had happened recently. Just seven years earlier, on a June afternoon, a majority of the Court had seized from the coastal States the offshore land the States had regarded as their own for 150 years. Some years before that, the Court had taken from the States authority over matters of domestic commerce that were clearly within the province of the States to manage as they wished. Indeed, from the time of *McCulloch vs. Maryland* and *Fletcher vs. Peck* and *Cohens vs. Virginia,* whole States frequently had been told by the Supreme Court that, as States, they had violated fundamental law. But most of the great reversals of the past had dealt with fairly impersonal issues — the regulation of insurance, the levying of taxes, the regulation of railways, the dominion over land. The school decision touched millions of individuals in the most intimate aspects of their personal lives; it had a human angle. And after the first wave of headlines had subsided, it became clear that the decision had a dramatic legal angle, too.

WHAT HAD THE Court done? In the eyes of the Court's defenders, Mr. Warren and his colleagues had done no more than others had done before them: They had "interpreted" the Constitution. But it was asked, *Is there no point at which "interpretation" ceases and substantive amendment begins?* Evidently no such line could be drawn. Then was it true that the power effectively to amend the fundamental law of the Union rested not with three-fourths of the states, but with a majority of five men on a court of nine? This was undoubtedly the fact. But what of the American system of checks and balances, by which government was to be restrained from seizing the liberties of the people? The ominous truth emerged as discussion continued, month by month: *There is no effective check upon the Supreme Court of the United States.* The sovereign States — the States that formed the Union and by their compact created the Court — lie virtually helpless before its decrees.

In the school case, the South's constitutional position was clear: Under the Tenth Amendment, all powers not prohibited *by the Constitution* to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people; the power to operate racially separate schools never was prohibited to the States by the Fourteenth Amendment or by any other provision of the Constitution, but on the contrary was clearly understood to be reserved to them; therefore, that power remains vested in the States respectively to this day, and can be prohibited to them only by amendment of the Constitution itself, and not by any judicial construction.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not the South's position that the Constitution should be viewed as a document of steel and ice, as some 18th-century leg-iron on society. The position taken by the Southern States was summed up once by Justice Sutherland. He agreed, in one of his dissenting opinions, that the Constitution is not static — that it is absurd to pretend that an absolute rule of *stare decisis* should be applied to constitutional constructions. The Constitution, he said, of course "is made up of living words that apply to every *new* condition." Then he added:

> But to say, if that be intended, that the words of the Constitution mean today what they did not mean when written — that is, *that they do not apply now to a situation to which they would have applied then* — is to rob that instrument of the essential element which continues it in force as the people have made it until they, and not their official agents, have made it otherwise.

That is what Hughes had in mind 20-odd years ago, when the Court rebuked a New Deal Congress on a question of labor relations. If the people wanted to vest the questioned power in Congress "in the appropriate manner," said Hughes, the people could do so, but

> it is not for the Court to amend the Constitution by judicial decree.

This was what Washington had in mind, in his farewell address: "But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

The grave question of the stability of the Constitution thus has come to be seen as the greatest issue to result from the school segregation cases. With this question there arises the companion question: What of the stability of the States themselves? What of the continued nature of the Union? Are any powers — any powers that mean anything — still "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"? Or must it be conceded that the States now have no powers guaranteed to them by law, but exercise only those powers tolerated by the Court? These are questions that concern not merely the Southern States, but the American Republic as a whole.

To be sure, the grave and difficult constitutional problem thus presented is not a new one: It existed in Jefferson's day, and in Calhoun's, and for that matter, in Teddy Roosevelt's also. It is to preserve unto the States, for good or ill, that which is rightfully the States' and to guard with equal jealousy that which is the proper function of the Federal Government. Yet to an alarming degree, the problem now is far more acute than it ever has been before. When Jefferson and Calhoun were protesting most furiously against internal improvements and discriminatory tariffs, enormous areas of public administration remained to the States; even at the turn of the century, States' Rights still held some meaning. Now, month by passing month, the States steadily are being stripped of the last of their sovereign powers — not by their own wish, as expressed through constitutional amendment — but by judicial usurpation.

THE END OF THIS process is the corruption of a constitutional union, by judicial fiat, into a consolidated Government in which the States are mere political dependencies. The end is a centralization of all significant powers in the hands of Federal authority. And so long as the constructions placed by the Court upon the Constitution are agreeable to one-third of the House of Representatives plus one, timely remedy cannot even be found in constitutional amendment.

The remedy lies — it must lie — in drastic resistance by the States, as *States,* to Federal encroachment. "If those who voluntarily created the system cannot be trusted to preserve it," asked Calhoun, "who can?" The checking and controlling influence of the people, exerted as of old, through their States, can indeed preserve the constitutional structure. The right to interpose the will of the sovereign people, in order that the evils of encroachment may be arrested, once more can be exerted toward the preservation of a Union and the dignity of States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A long time ago, a great Virginian had this to say: "So far as our own Government is concerned, I venture to predict that it will become absolute and irresponsible, precisely in proportion as the rights of the States shall cease to be respected and their authority to interpose for the correction of Federal abuses shall be denied and overthrown."

Abel Parker Upshur's prediction of 1840 has been grimly fulfilled. The American people have lost sight of the old concept that the States, as such, form the balance wheel — in Upshur's term, "the only effectual check upon Federal encroachments." We have lived to see the truth of his prophecy, that the danger to constitutional separation of powers is "not that the States will interpose too often, but that they will rather submit to Federal usurpations, than incur the risk of embarrassing that Government, by any attempts to check and control it."

THE STATES HAVE submitted too long to Federal usurpations. At their grave peril, they can submit no longer. Through every device of interposition they can bring to bear — political, legislative, judicial — once more they must invoke their sovereign powers to insist that Federal encroachments be restrained. Thankfully, half a dozen Southern States, by legislative resolution, have indicated their willingness to pursue this course in the field of public schools. By overwhelming vote, the people of Texas have approved a restatement of interposition chiefly as to State control of natural resources. The State Supreme Court of Georgia has not hesitated to rebuke the Supreme Court in Washington: "We will not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State."

This awakening of State sovereignty, met at first with mockery and ridicule, will be met next with all the hostility and force that centralists can bring to bear. If this force is to be overcome, the conservatives of this Republic — those who believe in limited government and in individual responsibility — must be prepared to risk those sacrifices which the hour demands. Others have risked them before — a Matthew Lyon in Vermont, a Michael Bright in Pennsylvania, a Troup in Georgia, a Calhoun in South Carolina, a Booth in Wisconsin, a Sullivan in Ohio, a Young in Minnesota. These and countless others, strong in their convictions, have dared to hold their ground when lesser men surrendered.

Yet there is one thing that also must be done. The States, for their own preservation, must insist upon shouldering those proper responsibilities they too often have abandoned by default. The people will not let the States sink into the insignificance of mere administrative suburbs if the great value and wisdom of local government can be impressed upon them.

"The people's highest interest," said Upshur, "is at home; their palladium is their own State governments. They ought to know that they can look nowhere else with perfect assurance of safety and protection. Let them then maintain those governments, not only in their rights, but in their dignity and influence. Make it the interest of their people to serve them: an interest strong enough to resist all the temptations of Federal office and patronage. Then alone will the voice [of the States] be heard with respect at Washington; then alone will their interposition avail to protect their own people against the usurpations of the great central power. It is vain to hope that the federative principle of our Government can be preserved, or that any thing can prevent it from running into the absolutism of consolidation, if we suffer the rights of the States to be filched away, and their dignity and influence to be lost, through our carelessness or neglect."

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED